REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, and 15-19, and 21 are amended. Claims 4, 14, and 20 are canceled. Claim 22 is newly added. Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-19, and 21-22 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 9-10, 14, 18-19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Moore et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,000,015). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as applied to the amended claims.

The independent claims recite elements related to associating computer network identifications with network policies. For example, independent claim 1 recites:

> analyzing a network interface associated with a client computer using a **plurality of network detectors**, the detectors **outputting** a set of **netspecs,** each netspec comprising **a first token** identifying a detector used for the analysis and **a second token** identifying the analyzed network interface;
> associating the network identifications made by the netspecs with locations; and
> feeding associated network identification/location pairs to a network interface module to implement desired network policies.

A plurality of network detectors analyze a network interface associated with a client computer. The detectors output a set of netspecs. Each netspec is comprised of two tokens. One of these tokens identifies the detector used for the analysis and the other token identifies the network interface. Amended independent claims 10 and 21 recite similar limitations. Support for these amendments is found throughout the specification, including at page 5, lines 1-13.

Moore does not disclose analyzing a network interface using a **plurality of network detectors** that **output** a set of **netspecs**, with each netspec comprised of **a first token** identifying a detector used for the analysis and **a second token** identifying the analyzed network interface as claimed. Moore describes a service that discovers the physical locations of a computer's connections to logical networks and provides that information to applications. (Abstract).

However, Moore does not disclose analyzing a network interface using a **plurality of network detectors**. In rejecting the "network detectors" element previously recited by claim 4, the Examiner states that the "NLRSP" disclosed by Moore is the detector. The "NLRSP" is defined as a Network Location Resolution Service Provider provided by a host computer that discovers aspects of new network connections. (column 13, lines 30-32). At no place does Moore describe analyzing a network interface using a plurality of NLRSPs. Thus, Moore does not disclose "a **plurality of network detectors**" as claimed.

Moore also does not disclose a plurality of network detectors that **output** a set of **netspecs**, each netspec comprising **a first token** identifying a detector used for the analysis and **a second token** identifying the analyzed network interface as claimed. The Examiner argues that Moore teaches a set of netspecs at column 13, lines 59-67 to column 14, line 1. However, this portion of the reference merely describes "a set formula" followed by the NLRSP when constructing names for networks. The set of netspecs recited by the independent claims are the output of a plurality of detectors, not a formula followed by the detectors. Thus, Moore does not disclose a plurality of detectors **outputting** a set of netspecs as claimed. Furthermore, Moore does not disclose the use of tokens and therefore does not

disclose that a netspec is comprised of **a first token** identifying a detector used for the analysis and **a second token** identifying the analyzed network interface as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 10, and 21 are not anticipated by Moore. The dependent claims not mentioned above incorporate the elements of their base claims and are not anticipated for at least the same reasons. The § 102 rejections should therefore be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 2-3, 5-8, 11-13, 15-17, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Moore in view of Aaron (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0268150). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as applied to the amended claims.

The Aaron reference does not remedy the deficiencies of Moore. Aaron discloses a system for providing network-based firewall policy configuration and facilitation. (Abstract). Thus, like Moore, Aaron does not teach or suggest "analyzing a network interface associated with a client computer using a **plurality of network detectors**, the detectors **outputting** a set of **netspecs,** each netspec comprising **a first token** identifying a detector used for the analysis **and a second token** identifying the analyzed network interface" as claimed. The combination of Moore and Aaron therefore cannot render obvious claims 2-3, 5-8, 11-13, 15-17, and 20. Applicants respectfully submit that the § 103 rejections of these claims should therefore be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request that the § 102 and § 103 rejections of the pending claims be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peter Linhardt

Date: April 22, 2008

By: /Brian Hoffman/

BRIAN M. HOFFMAN, REG. NO.: 39,713
FENWICK & WEST LLP
555 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94104
Tel.: (415) 875-2484
Fax: (415) 281-1350